

1                   **IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

2 Application Serial No. .... 09/887,524  
3 Filing Date ..... 06/21/2001  
3 Inventorship ..... Simon et al.  
4 Applicant..... Microsoft Corporation  
4 Group Art Unit ..... 2162  
Examiner ..... Truong, Cam Y T  
5 Attorney's Docket No. .... MS1-744US  
Title: *Automated Generator of Input-Validation Filters*

6                   **CoverPage for the Amended Appeal Brief**

7                   The Office sent a "Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (37 CFR  
8 41.37)" on 4/4/2006. The Office indicated that the Appeal Brief "lacked of  
9 concise statement of each ground of the rejections" (item #5 on the numbered list  
10 of possible non-compliant elements) and more particularly the indication of the  
11 claims to be reviewed overlapped with the cancelled claims. Applicant submits  
12 this Amended Appeal Brief has the claim set correctly presented.

13                   Respectfully Submitted,

14                   Dated: 4. 28.06

15                   By:



Kasey C. Christie  
Reg. No. 40559  
(509) 324-9256 x232  
[kasey@leehayes.com](mailto:kasey@leehayes.com)  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)

421 West Riverside, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
P: 509.324.9256  
F: 509.323.8879  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)

**lee & hayes**

1  
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2  
Application Serial No. ....09/887,524  
3  
Filing Date .....06/21/2001  
4  
Inventorship .....Simon et al.  
Applicant..... Microsoft Corporation  
Group Art Unit .....2162  
Examiner .....Truong, Cam Y T  
Attorney's Docket No. ....MS1-744US  
Title: *Automated Generator of Input-Validation Filters*

7  
**AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF**

8  
**In response to Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (37 CFR 41.37)**  
9  
dated 4/4/2006

10  
To: MS: Appeal Brief - Patents  
11  
Commissioner for Patents  
12  
P.O. Box 1450  
13  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
14  
  
From: Kasey C. Christie (Tel. 509-324-9256; Fax 509-323-8979)  
15  
Customer No. 22801  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.192, Applicant hereby submits an appeal brief for Application No. 09/887,524. A Notice of Appeal was filed August 11, 2005. Accordingly, Applicant appeals to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences seeking review of the Examiner's rejections.

421 West Riverside, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
P: 509-324-9256  
F: 509-323-8979  
www.leehayes.com



1  
2 TABLE OF CONTENTS  
3

---

4	<u>Appeal Brief Items</u>	5	<u>Page</u>
6	(1) Real Party in Interest	7	3
7	(2) Related Appeals, Interferences, and Judicial Proceedings	8	3
8	(3) Status of Claims	9	4
9	(4) Status of Amendments	10	5
10	(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	11	6
11	(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	12	10
12	(7) Argument	13	11
13	(8) Appendix of Appealed Claims	14	30

421 West Riverside, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
P: 509.324.9256  
F: 509.323.8879  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)



**(1) Real Party in Interest**

The real party in interest is the Microsoft Corporation, the assignee of all right and title to the subject invention.

21 West Riverside, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
P: 509.324-9256  
F: 509.323-8979  
[www.jeffhayes.com](http://www.jeffhayes.com)

lees & hayes

Serial No.: 09/887,524  
Atty Docket No.: MS1-744US  
**AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF**

421 West Riverside, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201

4  
lee&hayes

Spokane, WA 99201  
P: 509.324-9256  
F: 509.323-8979  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**(2) Related Appeals, Interferences, and Judicial Proceedings**

Appellant is not aware of any other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect, be directly affected by, or otherwise have a bearing on the Board's decision to this pending appeal.

5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Serial No.: 09/887,524  
Atty Docket No.: MS1-744US  
**AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF**

4

0427061506 O:\DOCS\MS1\0744\US10X\0025.DOC  
atty:kasey christie

### (3) Status of Claims

Claims 1-21, 24-33, 42, 46-51, 54-58 stand rejected and are pending in this Application, and are set forth in the Appendix of Appealed Claims on page 30. Claims 1-58 were originally filed in the Application. No claims have been allowed. Claims 22, 23, 34-41, 43-45, 52, 53 have been canceled, withdrawn, and/or non-elected. Claims 1, 4, 19, 42, and 50 have been amended.

Claims 1-21, 24-33, 42, 46-51, 54-58 are subject of this appeal and stand rejected as set forth in a Final Office Action dated March 11, 2005 (hereinafter, the "FINAL ACTION").

As set forth in the FINAL ACTION, claims 1-21, 24-33, 42, 46-51, 54-58 stand rejected under USC § 103(a) as being obvious in light of a combination of two or more of the following references:

- **Fields:** *Fields et al.*, US Patent No. 6,605,120 (issued Aug. 12, 2003);
  - **Lynch:** *Lynch et al.*, US Patent No. 6,558,431 (issued May 6, 2003);
  - **Motoyama:** *Motoyama et al.*, US Patent No. 6,085,196 (issued June 4, 2000).

#### **(4) Status of Amendments**

The Applicant responded to a non-final Office Action issued on August 27, 2004 (hereinafter, the “NON-FINAL ACTION”). In that response, Applicant canceled claims 22, 23, 34-41, 43, 44, 52, 53 and amended claims 1, 4, 19, 42, and 50. Applicant traversed all substantive rejections.

After that, the FINAL ACTION issued on March 11, 2005—the action dismissing Applicant's traversal and maintaining the rejection of all pending claims. In Applicant's response to the FINAL ACTION, Applicant traversed all substantive rejections, amended no other claims, and canceled no other claims. No other amendments have been filed subsequent to the FINAL ACTION.

The Office did not issue an advisory action. No other amendments have been filed subsequent to the FINAL ACTION.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

Broadly speaking, the claimed subject matter describes a technology for facilitating the automated generation of input-validation software filters. Using a user-interface for the described technology, a user is able to quickly enter a set of parameters (i.e., input-description-data) defining valid inputs. From this input-description-data, input-validation filters are automatically generated. An input-validation filter is a set of instructions for filtering input directly provided by a computing component without human intervention based upon the properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data.

Following is a concise explanation of each independent involved in the Appeal, including cites to the specification and specific reference characters. These specific reference characters are examples of particular elements of the drawings for certain claimed embodiments. It is to be appreciated and understood that the claims are not to be limited to solely the elements corresponding to these reference characters and that this section is provided to comply with the requirement of 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(v).

Specifically:

Claim 1 includes obtaining input-description-data [p. 22, lines 3-5; block 210 of Fig. 2, p. 17, line 5 through p. 18, line 11; item 172 of Fig. 1]; transforming that input-description-data into a data structure [p. 22, lines 5-7; block 212 of Fig. 2, p. 18, line 13 through p. 19, line 9; item 176 of Fig. 1]; automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input directly provided by a computing component without human intervention based upon the properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data, [p. 22, lines 9-15; block 216 of Fig. 2, p. 19,

1 line 11 through p. 20, line 2; item 180 of Fig. 1] The input-description-data define  
2 the properties of valid input directly provided by a computing component without  
3 human intervention and the data structure is an organized representation of the  
4 input-description-data.

5  
6 Claim 19 includes obtaining input-description-data [p. 22, lines 3-5; block  
7 210 of Fig. 2, p. 17, line 5 through p. 18, line 11; item 172 of Fig. 1];  
8 transforming the input-description-data into a data structure [p. 22, lines 5-7; block  
9 212 of Fig. 2, p. 18, line 13 through p. 19, line 9; item 176 of Fig. 1]; storing the  
10 data structure in a persistent form [p. 22, lines 5-8; block 214 of Fig. 2]; and  
11 automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input provided by a  
12 computing component based upon the properties of valid input defined by the  
13 input-description-data. [p. 22, lines 9-15; block 216 of Fig. 2, p. 19, line 11  
14 through p. 20, line 2; item 180 of Fig. 1] Here, the generating acquires the  
15 properties for generating the set of instructions from the data structure. The input-  
16 description-data define the properties of valid input provided by a computing  
17 component.  
18

19  
20 Claim 42 includes a user-interface for obtaining input-description-data [p.  
21 22, lines 3-5; block 210 of Fig. 2, p. 17, line 5 through p. 18, line 11; item 172 of  
22 Fig. 1]; a transformer configured to transform the input-description-data into a  
23 data structure [p. 22, lines 5-7; block 212 of Fig. 2, p. 18, line 13 through p. 19,  
24 line 9; item 176 of Fig. 1]; a memory configured to store the data structure [p. 22,  
25 lines 5-8; block 214 of Fig. 2; item 906 of Fig. 3]; and a filter-instructions  
automatic generator (“autogen”) configured to automatically generate a set of



1 instructions for filtering input provided by a computing component based upon the  
2 properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data. [p. 22, lines 9-15;  
3 block 216 of Fig. 2, p. 19, line 11 through p. 20, line 2; item 180 of Fig. 1] Here,  
4 the filter-instructions autogen is further configured to acquire the properties from  
5 the data structure when automatically generating the set of instructions. The input-  
6 description-data define the properties of valid input provided by a computing  
7 component.

8

9       Claim 50 includes obtaining input-description-data [p. 22, lines 3-5; block  
10 210 of Fig. 2, p. 17, line 5 through p. 18, line 11; item 172 of Fig. 1];  
11 transforming the input-description-data into a data structure [p. 22, lines 5-7; block  
12 212 of Fig. 2, p. 18, line 13 through p. 19, line 9; item 176 of Fig. 1]; storing the  
13 data structure in a persistent form [p. 22, lines 5-8; block 214 of Fig. 2]; and  
14 automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input provided by a  
15 computing component based upon the properties of valid input defined by the  
16 input-description-data. [p. 22, lines 9-15; block 216 of Fig. 2, p. 19, line 11  
17 through p. 20, line 2; item 180 of Fig. 1] Here, the generating acquires the  
18 properties for generating the set of instructions from the data structure. The input-  
19 description-data define the properties of valid input provided by a computing  
20 component.

21

22       Claim 54 includes obtaining input-description-data [p. 22, lines 3-5; block  
23 210 of Fig. 2, p. 17, line 5 through p. 18, line 11; item 172 of Fig. 1] and  
24 automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input provided by a  
25 computing component based upon the properties of valid input defined by the

1 input-description-data. [p. 22, lines 9-15; block 216 of Fig. 2, p. 19, line 11  
2 through p. 20, line 2; item 180 of Fig. 1] The input-description-data define the  
3 properties of valid input provided by a computing component.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

A. Whether 1-4, 6-20, 24-33, 42, 46-51, and 54-58 are obvious under USC § 103(a) and based upon the combination of **Fields** and **Lynch** disclosures and whether the Office has satisfactorily met its burden to show that these claims are obvious and that the combination of references is proper?

B. Whether claims 5 and 21 are obvious under USC § 103(a) and based upon the combination of **Fields**, **Lynch** and **Motoyama** disclosures and whether the Office has satisfactorily met its burden to show that these claims are obvious and that the combination of references is proper?

## **(7) Argument**

Issue A -- Whether 1-4, 6-20, 24-33, 42, 46-51, and 54-58 are obvious under USC § 103(a) and based upon the combination of Fields and Lynch disclosures and whether the Office has satisfactorily met its burden to show that these claims are obvious and that the combination of references is proper?

## Cited References

The Office cites **Fields** as its primary reference and **Lynch** as its secondary reference in all of its obviousness-based rejections.

Fields

**Fields** describes a technology for automatically defining a filter used to extract web content for a web page, wherein the extracted content is used in a recast web page.

The recast web page may be produced by a hosting site, or may be part of an effort to revise a web site at a web content provider. First, a set of pages, possibly a single page, is retrieved from a content provider web server. Next, the web page is parsed to identify a set of selectable content elements. Next, a representation of the original web page is presented in a user interface, wherein the selectable content elements are demarcated. The user will select some of the elements for inclusion in the filter through the user interface, whereby the tool will indicate the selected content elements for inclusion in the filter.

1           **Fields** discloses the construction of the filter so that when the filter is used,  
2 the selected content elements are extracted from a retrieved web page from the  
3 content provider web server and reused in the recast web page. As part of the  
4 process of identifying the selectable content elements, a set of varied headers can  
5 be used to retrieve multiple versions of the same web page. In this way, the  
6 multiple versions of the web page are compared to identify static and dynamic  
7 content elements and marked as static or dynamic.

8

9 Lynch

10           **Lynch** describes an editor for allowing web authors to edit HTML visually  
11 while preserving the HTML source document.

12           The editor preserves the structure and format of the HTML, and permits  
13 simultaneous modeless visual and source document editing. When an edit is made  
14 with the invention, only the HTML source around that edit is updated, rather than  
15 rewriting the whole HTML source document.

16           Furthermore, when an edit is made, the new HTML source code is  
17 outputted in a format that is specified by the user. In order to preserve the format  
18 of the document, format information is stored in the parsed tree. The format of the  
19 node is preserved when its source is regenerated; edits to the node will reformat it  
20 according to user preferences. In order to preserve the structure of the document,  
21 invalid HTML structures are maintained and not corrected.

22           The editor will either support the invalid structure by reflecting such  
23 structure in the parsed tree (and thus allow for editing of the structure) or the  
24 editor will not support such a structure, and represent such structures as invalid



1 nodes. Moreover, the editor also maintains structure while editing, as the structure  
2 and format of the document is only minimally modified during editing, i.e. only  
3 the nodes affected by the edits are restructured and reformatted, and the remainder  
4 of the document is unmodified.  
5

6 *Claim 1*

7 For the reader's convenience, the subject matter of this claim is provided  
8 below [with Office's cites to the references provided in brackets]:  
9

10 obtaining input-description-data, **[Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25]**  
11 which define the properties of valid input directly provided by a computing  
12 component without human intervention; **[Lynch, col. 3, lines 30-60]**

13 transforming the input-description-data into a data structure,  
14 wherein the data structure is an organized representation of the input-  
15 description-data; **[Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25]**

16 from the organized representation of the input-description-data of  
17 the data structure, **[Fields, col. 5, lines 20-25]** automatically generating a  
18 set of instructions for filtering input directly provided by a computing  
19 component without human intervention **[Fields, col. 5, lines 1-30]** based  
20 upon the properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data.  
21 **[Lynch, col. 3, lines 30-60]**

22 Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to establish a *prima  
facie* case of obviousness for rejecting this claim in the NON-FINAL and FINAL  
23 ACTIONS. Applicant submits that the combination of **Fields** and **Lynch** does  
24 not disclose all of the elements and features of this rejected claim. Generally, the  
25 combination of the cited references does not disclose input-description-data being



1 transformed into a “data structure” which becomes the source of generated  
2 instructions and an automatic generation of a set of instructions.

3 More particularly, Applicant submits that neither reference discloses “from  
4 the organized representation of the input-description-data of the data structure,  
5 automatically generating a set of instructions....” In addition, Applicant submits  
6 that neither reference discloses the automatic generation of a set of instructions for  
7 filtering input. Instead, **Fields** discloses the automatic generation of “filter  
8 definitions,” which are not instructions.

9 **FROM the data structure**

10 Applicant submits that the combination of the cited references does not  
11 disclose a transformation of the “input-description-data” into a “data structure,”  
12 which becomes the source of generated instructions. Rather, the references  
13 disclose an “HTML source” being transformed into an “HTML template,” but that  
14 HTML template is not the source for generation of “filter definitions.”

15 Applicant submits that **Fields** does not generate its “filter definitions” from  
16 the “HTML template.” Rather, **Fields** generates its “filter definitions” from  
17 parsing of the “HTML source.” In col. 9, lines 58-64, **Fields** discusses “filter  
18 definition” creation:

19 The document filters can be created through several methods,  
20 including the analysis of the HTML source code, imbedded comments or  
21 delimiters and through comparisons with similar documents. Once the  
22 style of the web site is understood, a filter can be developed to look for  
23 the portion of the original document in which the hosting site is  
24 interested in reformatting.

1           Applicant submits that **Fields'** "filter definitions" are not produced by  
2 **Fields** from its "HTML template"; rather the definitions are produced by parsing  
3 its "HTML source." Therefore, **Fields** does not disclose what this claim recites.

4           The Office asserts that **Fields'** "HTML source" is equivalent to both the  
5 recited input ("input-description-data") and output ("the data structure") of the  
6 recited transformation. Applicant submits that the Office still has not identified  
7 where the cited references disclose such a transformation. In addition, the Office  
8 has not explained how the **Fields'** "HTML source" can be both the input and the  
9 output of a function. Therefore, neither of the cited references discloses what this  
10 claim recites.

11 **Set of Instructions ≠ Filter Definition**

12           Furthermore, Applicant submits that neither reference (**Fields** or **Lynch**)  
13 discloses the automatic generation of a "set of instructions" for filtering input.  
14 Instead, **Fields** discloses the automatic generation of "filter definitions," which are  
15 not instructions. This claim recites the generation of a "set of instructions."  
16 Applicant submits that **Fields'** "filter definitions" are not the same as the recited  
17 "set of instructions."

18           At col. 12, line 48 through col. 22, line 24 and in U.S. Patent Application  
19 Serial No. 09/113,678, titled "Distribution Mechanism for Filtering, Formatting  
20 and Reuse of Web Based Content" (which is incorporated by reference into  
21 **Fields**), "filter definitions" are data and not a set of commands. Therefore, **Fields**  
22 supports this interpretation that "filter definitions" are not equivalent to "set of  
23 instructions." Applicant submits that **Fields'** "filter definitions" are not a "set of  
24 instructions."

1 instructions" as recited in the claims, rather the definitions are data and  
2 information.

3 Applicant submits that the Office has not explained how the Office can  
4 consider **Fields'** "filter definitions" to be the recited "set of instructions" when  
5 **Fields**, itself, indicates that its filter definitions include data instead of commands.  
6 Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has not shown that the combination  
7 of the cited references discloses all of the claimed features and elements.  
8

9 Claims 2-18

10 These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 1. As discussed  
11 above, claim 1 is allowable. In addition to its own merits, each of these dependent  
12 claims is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable.  
13

14 Claim 19

15 For the reader's convenience, the subject matter of this claim is provided  
16 below [with Office's cites to the references provided in brackets]:  
17

18 obtaining input-description-data, [**Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25**]  
19 which define the properties of valid input provided by a computing  
20 component; [**Lynch, col. 3, lines 30-60**]

21 transforming the input-description-data into a data structure;  
22 [**Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25**]

23 storing the data structures in a persistent form;

24 automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input  
25 provided by a computing component based upon the properties of valid  
input defined by the input-description-data, [**Fields, col. 5, lines 1-30**]

1           wherein the generating acquires the properties for generating the set of  
2           instructions from the data structure. [Fields, col. 5, lines 20-25]

3           Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to establish a *prima*  
4           ~~facie~~ case of obviousness for rejecting this claim in the NON-FINAL and FINAL  
5           ACTIONS. Applicant submits that the combination of **Fields** and **Lynch** does  
6           not disclose all of the elements and features of the rejected claims. Generally, the  
7           combination of the cited references does not disclose input-description-data being  
8           transformed into a “data structure” which becomes the source of generated  
9           instructions and an automatic generation of a set of instructions.

10          More particularly, Applicant submits that neither reference discloses:  
11          “wherein the generating acquires the properties for generating the set of  
12          instructions from the data structure.” In addition, Applicant submits that neither  
13          reference discloses the automatic generation of a set of instructions for filtering  
14          input. Instead, **Fields** discloses the automatic generation of “filter definitions,”  
15          which are not instructions.

16          **FROM the data structure**

17          As discussed above on page 30, Applicant submits that the combination of  
18          the cited references does not disclose a transformation of the “input-description-  
19          data” into a “data structure,” which becomes the source of generated instructions.  
20          Rather, the references disclose an “HTML source” being transformed into an  
21          “HTML template,” but that HTML template is not the source for generation of  
22          “filter definitions.”

23          The Office asserts that **Fields’** “HTML source” is equivalent to both the  
24          recited input (“input-description-data”) and output (“the data structure”) of the  
25

1 recited transformation. Applicant submits that the Office still has not identified  
2 where the cited references disclose such a transformation. In addition, the Office  
3 has not explained how the **Fields'** "HTML source" can be both the input and the  
4 output of a function. Therefore, neither of the cited references discloses what this  
5 claim recites.

6 **Set of Instructions ≠ Filter Definition**

7 As discussed above on page 16, Applicant further submits that neither  
8 reference (**Fields** or **Lynch**) discloses the automatic generation of a "set of  
9 instructions" for filtering input. Instead, **Fields** discloses the automatic generation  
10 of "filter definitions," which are not instructions. This claim recites the generation  
11 of a "set of instructions." Applicant submits that **Fields'** "filter definitions" are  
12 not the same as the recited "set of instructions."

13 Applicant submits that the Office has not explained how the Office can  
14 consider **Fields'** "filter definitions" to be the recited "set of instructions" when  
15 **Fields**, itself, indicates that its filter definitions include data instead of commands.  
16 Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has not shown that the combination  
17 of the cited references discloses all of the claimed features and elements.

18 **Claims 20, 21, 24-33**

19 These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 19. As discussed  
20 above, claim 19 is allowable. As discussed above, claim 19 is allowable. In  
21 addition to its own merits, each of these dependent claims is allowable for the  
22 same reasons that its base claim is allowable.

1           *Claim 42*

2           For the reader's convenience, the subject matter of this claim is provided  
3           below [with Office's cites to the references provided in brackets]:

4                 an user interface for obtaining input-description-data, **[Fields, col.**  
5           **5, lines 15-25]** which define the properties of valid input provided by a  
6           computing component; **Lynch, col. 3, lines 30-60]**

7                 a transformer configured to transform the input-description-data  
8           into a data structure; **[Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25]**

9                 a memory, wherein the memory is configured to store the data  
10           structure;

11                 a filter-instructions automatic generator ("autogen") configured to  
12           automatically generate a set of instructions for filtering input provided by a  
13           computing component **[Fields, col. 5, lines 1-30]** based upon the  
14           properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data, wherein the  
15           filter-instructions autogen is further configured to acquire the properties  
16           from the data structure when automatically generating the set of  
17           instructions.**[Fields, col. 5, lines 20-25]**

18                 Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to establish a *prima*  
19           *facie* case of obviousness for rejecting this claim in the NON-FINAL and FINAL  
20           ACTIONS. Applicant submits that the combination of **Fields** and **Lynch** does  
21           not disclose all of the elements and features of the rejected claims. Generally, the  
22           combination of the cited references does not disclose input-description-data being  
23           transformed into a "data structure" which becomes the source of generated  
24           instructions and an automatic generation of a set of instructions.

25                 More particularly, Applicant submits that neither reference discloses:  
26           "wherein the filter-instructions autogen is further configured to acquire the  
27           properties from the data structure when automatically generating the set of



1 instructions.” In addition, Applicant submits that neither reference discloses the  
2 automatic generation of a set of instructions for filtering input. Instead, **Fields**  
3 discloses the automatic generation of “filter definitions,” which are not  
4 instructions.

5 **FROM the data structure**

6 As discussed above on page 30, Applicant submits that the combination of  
7 the cited references does not disclose a transformation of the “input-description-  
8 data” into a “data structure,” which becomes the source of generated instructions.  
9 Rather, the references disclose an “HTML source” being transformed into an  
10 “HTML template,” but that HTML template is not the source for generation of  
11 “filter definitions.”

12 The Office asserts that **Fields’** “HTML source” is equivalent to both the  
13 recited input (“input-description-data”) and output (“the data structure”) of the  
14 recited transformation. Applicant submits that the Office still has not identified  
15 where the cited references disclose such a transformation. In addition, the Office  
16 has not explained how the **Fields’** “HTML source” can be both the input and the  
17 output of a function. Therefore, neither of the cited references discloses what this  
18 claim recites.

19 **Set of Instructions ≠ Filter Definition**

20 As discussed above on page 16, Applicant further submits that neither  
21 reference (**Fields** or **Lynch**) discloses the automatic generation of a “set of  
22 instructions” for filtering input. Instead, **Fields** discloses the automatic generation  
23 of “filter definitions,” which are not instructions. This claim recites the generation  
24 of “filter definitions,” which are not instructions. This claim recites the generation  
25

1 of a “set of instructions.” Applicant submits that **Fields’** “filter definitions” are  
2 not the same as the recited “set of instructions.”

3 Applicant submits that the Office has not explained how the Office can  
4 consider **Fields’** “filter definitions” to be the recited “set of instructions” when  
5 **Fields**, itself, indicates that its filter definitions include data instead of commands.  
6 Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has not shown that the combination  
7 of the cited references discloses all of the claimed features and elements.

8

9 Claims 46-49

10 These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 42. As discussed  
11 above, claim 42 is allowable. As discussed above, claim 42 is allowable. In  
12 addition to its own merits, each of these dependent claims is allowable for the  
13 same reasons that its base claim is allowable.

14

15 Claims 50

16 For the reader’s convenience, the subject matter of this claim is provided  
17 below [with Office’s cites to the references provided in brackets]:

18  
19 obtaining input-description-data, **[Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25]**  
20 which define the properties of valid input provided by a computing  
21 component; **[Lynch, col. 3, lines 30-60]**

22 transforming the input-description-data into a data structure;  
23 **[Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25]**

24 storing the data structures in a persistent form;

25 automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input  
provided by a computing component based upon the properties of valid  
input defined by the input-description-data, **[Fields, col. 5, lines 1-30]**

1           wherein the generating acquires the properties for generating the set of  
2           instructions from the data structure. [Fields, col. 5, lines 20-25]

3           Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to establish a *prima*  
4           ~~facie~~ case of obviousness for rejecting this claim in the NON-FINAL and FINAL  
5           ACTIONS. Applicant submits that the combination of **Fields** and **Lynch** does  
6           not disclose all of the elements and features of the rejected claims. Generally, the  
7           combination of the cited references does not disclose input-description-data being  
8           transformed into a “data structure” which becomes the source of generated  
9           instructions and an automatic generation of a set of instructions.

10          More particularly, Applicant submits that neither reference discloses:  
11          “wherein the generating acquires the properties for generating the set of  
12          instructions from the data structure.” In addition, Applicant submits that neither  
13          reference discloses the automatic generation of a set of instructions for filtering  
14          input. Instead, **Fields** discloses the automatic generation of “filter definitions,”  
15          which are not instructions.

16 **FROM the data structure**

17          As discussed above on page 30, Applicant submits that the combination of  
18          the cited references does not disclose a transformation of the “input-description-  
19          data” into a “data structure,” which becomes the source of generated instructions.  
20          Rather, the references disclose an “HTML source” being transformed into an  
21          “HTML template,” but that HTML template is not the source for generation of  
22          “filter definitions.”

23          The Office asserts that **Fields’** “HTML source” is equivalent to both the  
24          recited input (“input-description-data”) and output (“the data structure”) of the  
25

421 West Riverside, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
P: 509.324.9256  
F: 509.323.8979  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)



1 recited transformation. Applicant submits that the Office still has not identified  
2 where the cited references disclose such a transformation. In addition, the Office  
3 has not explained how the **Fields**' "HTML source" can be both the input and the  
4 output of a function. Therefore, neither of the cited references discloses what this  
5 claim recites.

6 **Set of Instructions ≠ Filter Definition**

7 As discussed above on page 16, Applicant further submits that neither  
8 reference (**Fields** or **Lynch**) discloses the automatic generation of a "set of  
9 instructions" for filtering input. Instead, **Fields** discloses the automatic generation  
10 of "filter definitions," which are not instructions. This claim recites the generation  
11 of a "set of instructions." Applicant submits that **Fields'** "filter definitions" are  
12 not the same as the recited "set of instructions."

13 Applicant submits that the Office has not explained how the Office can  
14 consider **Fields'** "filter definitions" to be the recited "set of instructions" when  
15 **Fields**, itself, indicates that its filter definitions include data instead of commands.  
16 Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has not shown that the combination  
17 of the cited references discloses all of the claimed features and elements.

18 **Claim 51**

19 This claim ultimately depends upon independent claim 50. As discussed  
20 above, claim 50 is allowable. As discussed above, claim 50 is allowable. In  
21 addition to its own merits, each of these dependent claims is allowable for the  
22 same reasons that its base claim is allowable.

Claim 54

For the reader's convenience, the subject matter of this claim is provided below [with Office's cites to the references provided in brackets]:

obtaining input-description-data, [Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25]  
which define the properties of valid input provided by a computing component; [Lynch, col. 3, lines 30-60]

automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input provided by a computing component based upon the properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data. [Fields, col. 5, lines 1-30]

Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for rejecting this claim in the NON-FINAL and FINAL ACTIONS. Applicant submits that the combination of **Fields** and **Lynch** does not disclose all of the elements and features of the rejected claims. In particular, Applicant submits that neither reference discloses the automatic generation of a set of instructions for filtering input. Instead, **Fields** discloses the automatic generation of "filter definitions," which are not instructions.

**Set of Instructions ≠ Filter Definition**

As discussed above on page 16, Applicant further submits that neither reference (**Fields** or **Lynch**) discloses the automatic generation of a "set of instructions" for filtering input. Instead, **Fields** discloses the automatic generation of "filter definitions," which are not instructions. This claim recites the generation of a "set of instructions." Applicant submits that **Fields'** "filter definitions" are not the same as the recited "set of instructions."

1           Applicant submits that the Office has not explained how the Office can  
2 consider **Fields**' "filter definitions" to be the recited "set of instructions" when  
3 **Fields**, itself, indicates that its filter definitions include data instead of commands.  
4 Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has not shown that the combination  
5 of the cited references discloses all of the claimed features and elements.

6

7 Claims 55-58

8           These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 54. As discussed  
9 above, claim 54 is allowable. As discussed above, claim 54 is allowable. In  
10 addition to its own merits, each of these dependent claims is allowable for the  
11 same reasons that its base claim is allowable.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

421 West Riverside, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
P: 509.324.9256  
F: 509.323.8970  
[www.bethayes.com](http://www.bethayes.com)



1                   **Issue B -- Whether claims 5 and 21 are obvious under USC § 103(a)**

2                   **and based upon the combination of Fields, Lynch and Motoyama**  
3                   **disclosures and whether the Office has satisfactorily met its burden to**  
4                   **show that these claims are obvious and that the combination of references**  
5                   **is proper?**

6  
7                   These claims (5 and 21) ultimately depend upon independent claims 1 or  
8                   19. As discussed above, these independent claims are allowable. In addition to its  
9                   own merits, each of these dependent claims is allowable for the same reasons that  
10                  its base claim is allowable.

11                  The Office relies on the combination of **Fields** and **Lynch** to reject the base  
12                  independent claims 1 and 19. Applicant submits that the combination of **Fields**  
13                  and **Lynch** does not disclose all of the elements and features of base independent  
14                  claims 1 and 19 and, that **Motoyama** does not cure those deficiencies.

15                  In particular, the combination of the cited references does not disclose  
16                  input-description-data being transformed into a “data structure” which becomes  
17                  the source of generated instructions and an automatic generation of a set of  
18                  instructions.

19                  For example, Applicant submits that neither reference discloses:

- 20                  • “from the organized representation of the input-description-data of  
21                   the data structure, automatically generating a set of instructions...”  
22                   [claim 1];  
23                  • “wherein the generating acquires the properties for generating the set  
24                   of instructions from the data structure.” [claim 19]

1 In addition, Applicant submits that neither reference discloses the automatic  
2 generation of a set of instructions for filtering input. Instead, **Fields** discloses the  
3 automatic generation of “filter definitions,” which are not instructions.

4 Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 5 and 21 are allowable over the  
5 combination of **Fields**, **Lynch** and **Motoyama** for at least the reason that the  
6 references do not teach or suggest the combination of claimed elements and  
7 features.

421 West Riverside, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
P: 509.324.9256  
F: 509.323.8979  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)



1  
**Conclusion**

2  
Appellant respectfully submits that all of the Examiner's rejections have  
3  
been traversed. As such, Appellant respectfully submits that all of the claims are  
4  
in condition for allowance.  
5

6  
7  
Dated: 4/28/06

8  
Respectfully Submitted,

9  
By:

10  
Kasey C. Christie  
Reg. No. 40559  
(509) 324-9256 x232  
[kasey@leehayes.com](mailto:kasey@leehayes.com)  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
421 West Riverside, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
P 509.324.9256  
F 509.323.8979  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)



1  
2  
3  
**(8) Appendix ofAppealed Claims**

4       **1. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** A method for automatic  
5 production of one or more sets of instructions for an input filter of a computer  
6 system, the method comprising:

7           obtaining input-description-data, which define the properties of valid input  
8 directly provided by a computing component without human intervention;

9           transforming the input-description-data into a data structure, wherein the  
10 data structure is an organized representation of the input-description-data;

11          from the organized representation of the input-description-data of the data  
12 structure, automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input directly  
13 provided by a computing component without human intervention based upon the  
14 properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data.

15  
16       **2. (ORIGINAL)** A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the  
17 generating comprises translating the organized representation of the input-  
18 description-data of the data structure into the set of instructions.

19  
20       **3. (ORIGINAL)** A method as recited in claim 2, wherein the  
21 translating comprises:

22           parsing the organized representation of the input-description-data of the  
23 data structure to acquire the input-description-data;

24           synthesizing the set of instructions based upon the input-description-data  
25 acquired by the parsing.



1  
2       **4. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)**      A method as recited in  
3 claim 1 further comprising storing the data structure in a persistent form.  
4

5  
6       **5. (ORIGINAL)**      A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the data  
7 structure is in a hierarchical markup language.  
8

9  
10      **6. (ORIGINAL)**      A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the set  
11 of instructions as an input filter.  
12

13  
14      **7. (ORIGINAL)**      A method as recited in claim 1 further  
15 comprising loading the set of instructions as an input filter.  
16

17  
18      **8. (ORIGINAL)**      A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the set  
19 of instructions is generated with regard to filtering input for an application  
20 program module.  
21

22  
23      **9. (ORIGINAL)**      A method as recited in claim 1, wherein input-  
24 description-data define the properties of input selected from a group consisting of  
25 valid input only, invalid input only, and both valid and invalid input.  
26

1           **10. (ORIGINAL)** A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the  
2 properties of valid input indicate parameters of input by defining boundary  
3 delimitations of such parameters and define assumptions regarding such  
4 parameters.

5  
6           **11. (ORIGINAL)** A method as recited in claim 1, wherein during  
7 the obtaining, input-description-data is obtained from a user via a graphical user  
8 interface.

9  
10          **12. (ORIGINAL)** A computer system comprising:  
11           an application program module configured to receive and respond to input  
12 provided by a computing component;  
13           an input filter module configured to receive input provided by a computing  
14 component for the application program module, filter the input, and pass the  
15 filtered input to the application program module,  
16           wherein the filter comprises one or more sets of instructions that, when  
17 executed, filter the input and such sets of instructions being automatically  
18 produced according to the method as recited in claim 1.

19  
20          **13. (ORIGINAL)** A computer system as recited in claim 12,  
21 wherein the computer system comprises a Web server.

1           **14. (ORIGINAL)** A computer system as recited in claim 12,  
2 wherein the input filter module is further configured to receive input from the  
3 computing component via a communications network.

4

5           **15. (ORIGINAL)** A computer-readable medium comprising a set  
6 of instructions for filtering input, wherein such set of instructions has been  
7 automatically produced by the method as recited in claim 1.

8

9           **16. (ORIGINAL)** An input filter of a computer having computer-  
10 executable instructions that, when executed, filter input, wherein such computer-  
11 executable instructions were automatically produced by the method as recited in  
12 claim 1.

13

14           **17. (ORIGINAL)** A computer comprising one or more computer-  
15 readable media having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by  
16 the computer, perform the method as recited in claim 1.

17

18           **18. (ORIGINAL)** A computer-readable medium having computer-  
19 executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs the method  
20 as recited in claim 1.

1           **19. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** A method facilitating  
2 speedy and efficient production of one or more sets of instructions for an input  
3 filter of a computer system, the method comprising:

4           obtaining input-description-data, which define the properties of valid input  
5 provided by a computing component;

6           transforming the input-description-data into a data structure;

7           storing the data structures in a persistent form;

8           automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input provided by  
9 a computing component based upon the properties of valid input defined by the  
10 input-description-data, wherein the generating acquires the properties for  
11 generating the set of instructions from the data structure.

12  
13           **20. (ORIGINAL)** A method as recited in claim 19 further  
14 comprising transforming the input-description-data into a data structure

15  
16           **21. (ORIGINAL)** A method as recited in claim 20, wherein the  
17 data structure is in a hierarchical markup language.

18  
19           **22. (CANCELED)**

20  
21           **23. (CANCELED)**

1  
2       **24. (ORIGINAL)** A method as recited in claim 19 further  
3 comprising loading the set of instructions as an input filter.

4  
5       **25. (ORIGINAL)** A method as recited in claim 19, wherein the  
6 properties of valid input indicate parameters of input by defining boundary  
7 delimitations of such parameters and define assumptions regarding such  
8 parameters.

9  
10      **26. (ORIGINAL)** A method as recited in claim 19, wherein during  
11 the obtaining, input-description-data is obtained from a user via a graphical user  
12 interface.

13  
14      **27. (ORIGINAL)** A computer-readable medium comprising a set  
15 of instructions for filtering input, wherein such set of instructions has been  
16 automatically produced by the method as recited in claim 19.

17  
18      **28. (ORIGINAL)** An input filter of a computer having computer-  
19 executable instructions that, when executed, filter input, wherein such computer-  
20 executable instructions were automatically produced by the method as recited in  
21 claim 19.

1           **29. (ORIGINAL)** A computer system comprising:  
2           an application program module configured to receive and respond to input  
3           provided by a computing component;  
4           an input filter module configured to receive input provided by a computing  
5           component for the application program module, filter the input, and pass the  
6           filtered input to the application program module,  
7           wherein the filter comprises one or more sets of instructions that, when  
8           executed, filter the input and such sets of instructions being automatically  
9           produced according to the method as recited in claim 19.

10  
11           **30. (ORIGINAL)** A computer system as recited in claim 29,  
12           wherein the computer system comprises a Web server.

13  
14           **31. (ORIGINAL)** A computer system as recited in claim 29,  
15           wherein the input filter module is further configured to receive input from the  
16           computing component via a communications network.

17  
18           **32. (ORIGINAL)** A computer comprising one or more computer-  
19           readable media having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by  
20           the computer, perform the method as recited in claim 19.

21  
22           **33. (ORIGINAL)** A computer-readable medium having computer-  
23           executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs the method  
24           as recited in claim 19.

1  
2 Claims 34-41 are CANCELED  
3  
4

5 **42. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** An automatic filter-  
6 instructions production system comprising:

7 an user interface for obtaining input-description-data, which define the  
8 properties of valid input provided by a computing component;

9 a transformer configured to transform the input-description-data into a data  
10 structure;

11 a memory, wherein the memory is configured to store the data structure;

12 a filter-instructions automatic generator ("autogen") configured to  
13 automatically generate a set of instructions for filtering input provided by a  
14 computing component based upon the properties of valid input defined by the  
15 input-description-data, wherein the filter-instructions autogen is further configured  
16 to acquire the properties from the data structure when automatically generating the  
17 set of instructions.

18  
19 **43. (CANCELED)**

20  
21 **44. (CANCELED)**

22  
23 **45. (CANCELED)**

421 West Riverside, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
P: 509.324.9256  
F: 509.323.8979  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)



1           **46. (ORIGINAL)** A system as recited in claim 42, wherein the  
2 input-description-data indicate input parameters by defining boundary  
3 delimitations of such parameters and define assumptions regarding such  
4 parameters.

5

6           **47. (ORIGINAL)** A computer-readable medium comprising a set  
7 of instructions for filtering input, wherein such set of instructions has been  
8 automatically produced by the system as recited in claim 42.

9

10          **48. (ORIGINAL)** An input filter of a computer having computer-  
11 executable instructions that, when executed, filter input, wherein such computer-  
12 executable instructions were automatically produced by the system as recited in  
13 claim 42.

14

15          **49. (ORIGINAL)** A system as recited in claim 42, wherein the  
16 interface is a graphical user interface.

17

18          **50. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** A system for facilitating  
19 the production of one or more sets of instructions, the system comprising:

20                 a memory comprising a set of computer program instructions; and  
21                 a processor coupled to the memory, the processor being configured to  
22 execute the computer program instructions, which comprise:

23                     obtaining input-description-data, which define the properties of valid  
24                     input provided by a computing component;

25                     transforming the input-description-data into a data structure;

421 West Riverside, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
P: 509.324.9256  
F: 509.323.8979  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)



storing the data structures in a persistent form;

automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input provided by a computing component based upon the properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data, wherein the generating acquires the properties for generating the set of instructions from the data structure.

**51. (ORIGINAL)** A system as recited in claim 50, wherein the input-description-data indicate input parameters by defining boundary delimitations of such parameters and define assumptions regarding such parameters.

**52. (CANCELED)**

**53. (CANCELED)**

**54. (ORIGINAL)** A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs the method comprising:

obtaining input-description-data, which define the properties of valid input provided by a computing component;

automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input provided by a computing component based upon the properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data.

1           **55. (ORIGINAL)** A computer-readable medium as recited in  
2 claim 54, wherein the method further comprises loading the set of instructions as  
3 an input filter.

4

5           **56. (ORIGINAL)** A computer-readable medium as recited in  
6 claim 54, wherein the input-description-data indicate input parameters by defining  
7 boundary delimitations of such parameters and define assumptions regarding such  
8 parameters.

9

10          **57. (ORIGINAL)** An input filter comprising a computer-readable  
11 medium as recited in claim 54.

12

13          **58. (ORIGINAL)** A computer comprising one or more computer-  
14 readable media as recited in claim 54.

421 West Riverside, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
P: 509.324.9256  
F: 509.323.8979  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)

**lee & hayes**